

Imageability, age of acquisition, and frequency factors in acronym comprehension

PLAYFOOT, David <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0855-334X>> and IZURA, Cristina

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/8447/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

PLAYFOOT, David and IZURA, Cristina (2013). Imageability, age of acquisition, and frequency factors in acronym comprehension. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 66 (6), 1131-1145.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>



Imageability, age of acquisition and frequency factors in acronym comprehension

Journal:	<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID:	QJE-STD 11-376.R1
Manuscript Type:	Standard Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Playfoot, David; Swansea University, Department of Psychology Izura, Cristine; Swansea University, Department of Psychology
Keywords:	acronyms, word association, frequency, imageability, age of acquisition

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Imageability, age of acquisition and frequency factors in acronym comprehension

Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology

David Playfoot, Department of Psychology, Swansea University, Swansea, SA2 8PP

Cristina Izura, Department of Psychology, Swansea University, Swansea, SA2 8PP

Abstract

In spite of their unusual orthographic and phonological form, acronyms (BBC, HIV, NATO) can become familiar to the reader, and their meaning can be accessed well enough that they are understood. The factors in semantic access for acronym stimuli were assessed using a word association task. Two analyses examined the time taken to generate a word association response to acronym cues. Responses were recorded more quickly to cues which elicited a large proportion of semantic responses, and those which were high in associative strength. Participants were shown to be faster to respond to cues which were imageable or early acquired. Frequency was not a significant predictor of word association responses. Implications for theories of lexical organisation are discussed.

1
2
3 The present study is concerned with acronyms, a significant part of our vocabulary that has
4 been largely neglected in word processing research. Acronyms are abbreviations of long
5 terms or cumbersome phrases commonly formed by selecting key letters within a term or
6 sentence (e.g., DNA from deoxyribonucleic acid, WWW from World Wide Web). As a result
7 of this process, acronyms can have very peculiar orthographies in conjunction with unusual
8 pronunciation patterns. Originally the term ‘acronym’ was coined to designate
9 pronounceable abbreviations (e.g., NATO, RADAR) while ‘initialism’ was the name selected
10 for unpronounceable abbreviations (e.g., PC, TV). However, despite this distinction acronym
11 is the word more commonly used to refer to all abbreviations, pronounceable or not, formed
12 as a combination of the initial letters of a term or sentence. It is in this more general sense
13 that the word acronym is used in the present study. In addition, only acronyms constituted by
14 a string of consonants, or vowels or a combination of vowels and consonants (e.g., BBC, EU,
15 HIV), will be discussed here.

16
17
18 The formation of acronyms is not new or unique to the English language. RIP (*Requiescat in*
19 *pace* – Rest in peace), for example, is an early acronym from the Latin. However, despite
20 their historical presence in all languages, acronym formation was never prolific in the distant
21 past. This changed dramatically a few decades ago when an increase in literacy and wealth,
22 and advances in science and technology popularised the generation of acronyms. The latest
23 emergence of Short Message Systems (SMS) has boosted the creation and use of acronyms at
24 a rate never experienced before.

25
26
27 Research on how acronyms are processed is scarce. The few studies that have looked at
28 acronym reading and recognition processes have been mainly interested in the lexicality
29 status of acronyms, the question of interest being whether acronyms storage and processing is
30 similar to that of mainstream words (Besner et al., 1984; Brysbaert, Speybroeck and
31 Vanderelst, 2009; Carr, Posner, Pollatsek & Snyder, 1979; Coltheart, 1978; Laszlo &
32 Federmeier, 2007a; 2007b; 2008; Noice & Hock, 1987; Prinzmetal & Millis-Wright, 1984).
33 The evidence accumulated so far indicates that despite the orthographic and phonological
34 peculiarities of acronyms they are cognitively similar to mainstream words and that are
35 processed in a similar manner, at least in the lexical tasks in which acronyms have been
36 tested so far.

37
38
39 The letter identification task and letter string matching task are some of the tasks used to look
40 at acronym processing. The identification of a given letter is commonly reported to be more
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 successful when it is embedded in a mainstream word than when the letter appears in an
4 illegal non-word (Reicher, 1969). Similarly, participants are faster to decide that two
5 simultaneously presented strings of letters are the same if the stimuli are words than if they
6 are illegal non-words (Carr et al., 1979). This is known as the word superiority effect (WSE).
7
8 An acronym superiority effect has also been observed in both tasks with faster identification
9 of letters within acronyms than within non-words and faster detection of similarities between
10 two letter strings when these are acronyms than when they are non-words (Besner et al.,
11 1984; Carr et al., 1979; Laszlo & Federmeier, 2007a; Noice & Hock, 1987). Prinzmetal and
12 Millis-Wright (1984) used a version of the Stroop task to compare acronyms, mainstream
13 words and non-words processes. Acronyms, words and non-words had each of their letters
14 printed in a different colour ink. Participants were asked to name the colour of specific letters
15 within the string. A greater number of errors were made in acronym and word trials than
16 when the letters were embedded within non-words. More recently acronyms have been
17 included in studies of word reading using the ERP technique (Laszlo & Federmeier, 2007b;
18 2008). The N400 component is a negative going deflection which is observed around 400ms
19 after the presentation of a stimulus. The amplitude of the N400 elicited by a word is larger
20 when it is first presented than when the same word is presented again. This repetition effect
21 is shown in response to words but not when the stimuli are non-words. Laszlo and
22 Federmeier (2007b; 2008) showed that a significant reduction in N400 amplitude was
23 observable for acronyms. Importantly, closer examination of their data revealed that the
24 repetition effect for acronyms was restricted to those items that the participants knew. That is
25 to say that known acronyms showed word-like N400 repetition effects, while unknown
26 acronyms elicited activity similar to non-words. In another recent study of acronyms, Izura
27 and Playfoot (in press) investigated whether acronym naming times were not just similar to
28 that of mainstream words but whether acronyms could be comparable to the way in which
29 regular or irregular words are processed in the English language. The study assessed the
30 influence of a number of variables on acronym naming using hierarchical regression
31 techniques. The analyses showed a combined influence of variables commonly associated to
32 regular and irregular word processing (e.g., number of letters, orthographic familiarity,
33 printed frequency, age of acquisition, imageability, etc.). The authors conclude that acronym
34 processing is not directly comparable to regular or irregular word processing but a complex
35 mixture of both.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The studies reviewed so far indicate that the way in which acronyms and mainstream words
4 are processed is similar overall but also that acronym recognition and naming has its own
5 processing peculiarities, as reflected in the type of factors influencing their processing. Since
6 the main motivation to study acronyms has been to determine whether the mental lexicon
7 accommodates the distinctive orthographic and phonological configuration of acronyms, no
8 research has examined the potential semantic singularity of acronyms. Thus, the present study
9 is the first effort to fill this gap. Here, individuals were encouraged to process acronyms
10 semantically using an acronym association task.

11
12
13 Although none of the research published so far has explored the semantic organization of
14 acronyms, Brysbaert et al.'s (2009) study is the only one to date that when examining the
15 potential similarity between acronyms and words emphasised meaning rather than form.
16 They used acronyms in an associative priming paradigm which specifically relies on semantic
17 links between the target and the prime. The common finding in priming tasks is that a
18 response to a target word is affected by the characteristics of an item that precedes it (the
19 prime), even if the prime disappears so quickly that it is not consciously detected. In
20 Brysbaert et al.'s (2009) study, participants were presented with a lexical decision task in
21 which word targets were preceded by briefly presented primes. In half of the 96 prime-target
22 pairs the prime was an acronym, and in half the prime was a word. Each of the targets was
23 presented twice, once preceded by a semantically related prime that could be an acronym
24 (e.g., BLT-SANDWICH) or a word (e.g., FIB-LIE), and once with an unrelated prime (SNT-
25 SANDWICH; HIM-LIE). Associative priming effects followed acronym primes as well as
26 word primes. The facilitation resulting from acronym primes was observed irrespective of
27 letter case. Thus, BLT, blt and bLt increased the speed of the response to the target by the
28 same amount. Brysbaert et al. (2009) concluded that this finding was "particularly
29 convincing for the lexical processing of acronyms" (pp. 1838).

30
31
32 As discussed above, the prevailing evidence indicates that acronyms are integrated in the
33 mental lexicon along with mainstream words. However, their lexicality does not resemble
34 that of regular or irregular words since processing differences have been detected (Izura &
35 Playfoot, in press). No study so far has explored the semantic configuration of acronyms and
36 assuming that it is the same as for mainstream words might be risky. In the present study we
37 investigated the factors that might affect the speed with which acronyms are understood in an
38 attempt to break the ice in the investigation of the semantics of acronyms.

1
2
3 The finding that associative priming effects are observed with acronym primes suggests that
4 their meaning is accessed quickly. Semantic network models posit that words (and possibly
5 acronyms) are stored as interconnected nodes (e.g. Steyvers & Tenenbaum, 2005). Each
6 node has a number of other nodes linked to it and connections between nodes gain in strength
7 every time they are used. Strong links are easy to access, and result in rapid activation. One
8 technique used to examine semantic or lexico-semantic connections is the discrete word
9 association task, in which participants are presented with a single word and required to
10 produce the first word that comes to their minds. In order to achieve this, participants are
11 forced to activate a second lexical representation which normally is semantically connected to
12 the target word. It is argued that the participant's response is the word that has been activated
13 quickest, and represents the strongest link between nodes (i.e., words) in the participant's
14 lexicon. By asking a large number of participants to provide associations to the same cues,
15 the way in which words might be semantically interconnected is inferred.
16
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Word association data is rich in nature. Among other things it provides a measure of the
strength of the link between cue and associate. Associative strength refers to the proportion
of participants who produce the same response. For example, if 58 out of 100 participants
said WHITE to the cue word BLACK, the associative strength between BLACK and WHITE
is 0.58. Research suggests that associative strength is a reliable indication of the
predominance of a particular response in the population (Nelson & Schreiber, 1992), and a
good predictor of priming effects (Canas, 1990). Another common measure used in word
association tasks is the number of different associative responses that are provided by more
than one participant. This has been called '*meaning set size*' (Nelson & Schreiber, 1992).
These two measures of associative response (i.e., associative strength and meaning set size)
will be considered in the present study along with the following lexico-semantic
characteristics of the cue words: word frequency, imageability, age of acquisition and letter
length. The findings related to these variables and predictions are discussed in turn below.

High frequency words are recognised, produced, and recalled faster and with greater accuracy
than low frequency words (Connine, Mullinex, Shernoff, & Yelen, 1990; Yonelinas, 2002).
As studies have shown that most of the associative responses are semantically linked to the
cue word (e.g., *computer* → *screen*), it is logical to think that word association requires word
recognition, a process influenced by word frequency. It would be expected, therefore, that an

1
2
3 influence of word frequency on word association responses would be observed. The
4 literature seems to indicate that the frequency of the cue does have some impact on the
5 strength and number of associations generated, but it is far from clear what this influence is.
6
7
8 Early investigations indicated that high frequency cues elicited a stronger dominant response
9 (i.e., produced by many individuals) than low frequency items, and fewer different responses
10 overall (Postman, 1964; 1970). However, de Groot (1989) found no significant effects of the
11 frequency of the cue word on the speed with which an associated word was produced,
12 contradicting the predictions of semantic network models. Furthermore, both de Groot
13 (1989, Experiment 7) and Brysbaert, Van Wijnendaele and De Deyne (2000) reported that
14 high frequency cues elicited more diverse responses than low frequency cues. Interestingly,
15 this was the inverse of the frequency effects reported by Postman (1964; 1970).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 One major tenet of semantic network models is that the link between two concepts should be
25 strengthened by its retrieval, thus the connections stemming from high frequency words
26 should be particularly well-travelled. De Groot's study instead demonstrated that the
27 imageability of a word was more important in the distribution and speed of word association
28 responses. Imageability refers to the ease with which a word evokes a mental image (Paivio,
29 Yuille, & Madigan, 1968). In discrete word association tasks, a smaller number of different
30 responses are elicited by words which are highly imageable. Correspondingly, the dominant
31 response to a high imageability cue word has a greater associative strength than that for a less
32 imageable cue, and in addition, the responses are generated more quickly (Altarriba, Bauer,
33 & Benvenuto, 1999; Brysbaert et al., 2000; de Groot, 1989). These findings were interpreted
34 as evidence that the links between highly imageable nodes and related concepts were stronger
35 than the links stemming from low imageable nodes.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Age of acquisition (AoA) refers to the moment in time in which words, objects and faces are
49 first learned. The common finding is that objects, faces and words learned early in life are
50 processed more quickly than those learned later (e.g. Brysbaert & Ghyselinck, 2006; Izura,
51 Pérez, Agallou, Wright, Marín, Stadthagen-González, & Ellis, 2011; Morrison & Ellis, 2000;
52 Pérez, 2007; Richards & Ellis, 2009). A current explanation for the AoA effect is the
53 arbitrary mappings hypothesis (Ellis & Lambon Ralph, 2000). It states that the AoA effect is
54 a product of the connections created during learning. When the relationship between input
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and output is predictable, a late acquired word can draw on existing knowledge to facilitate
4 processing. In regular words, for example, the relationship of spelling to sound is consistent
5 with other similarly spelled words (e.g., *sweet, feet*). Thus, a newly learned word can map on
6 to existing representations (e.g., *tweet*). However, in irregular words the pronunciation is less
7 predictable and the mapping is arbitrary (e.g., *yacht*). Under these circumstances late
8 acquired words do not benefit from existing word knowledge and processing is relatively
9 slow. The mapping between the written representation of a word and its meaning is even less
10 predictable than the relationship between spelling and sound. Retrieving semantic
11 information is, according to the mapping hypothesis, likely to be influenced by age of
12 acquisition, and effects ought to be observed in the generating words in response to a cue as
13 in Catling and Johnson's (2005) study. Catling and Johnson (2005) asked participants to
14 produce a word from a semantic category (e.g. vegetables) that began with a particular letter
15 (e.g. 'c'). They reported that participants were significantly faster to provide early acquired
16 words than late acquired words. Word association responses have also been shown to be
17 affected by age of acquisition. Van Loon-Vervorm (1989, cited by Brysbaert et al., 2000)
18 showed that responses in a discrete association task were recorded reliably faster (240 ms)
19 when the cue was early-acquired. Brysbaert et al. (2000) replicated Van Loon-Vervorm's
20 (1989) findings. They reported that early-acquired words elicited association responses 279
21 ms faster than late acquired words. Further, Brysbaert et al. (2000) provided evidence that
22 there is greater agreement among participants in the associations generated for early-acquired
23 words. Brysbaert et al (2000) pointed to the interpretation that the strength of the semantic
24 connections from early-acquired word nodes is greater than from nodes for late-acquired
25 words.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In sum, the study of the influence of the characteristics of the cue words on word association
46 response times has the potential to inform about the strength and diversity of the semantic
47 connections and with that shed some light on the structure of the semantic configuration of
48 acronyms. It is important to note, however, that associative responses are not always semantic
49 in nature. In fact a number of studies have devoted their attention to the nature of the
50 relationship between a cue-word and its associate. Thus, word association responses have
51 been grouped into three major categories depending on the relationship between cue-word
52 and associative response (Fitzpatrick, 2006; 2007; 2009). These three groups are: *meaning-*
53 *based associations* which have a semantic relationship with the cue-word (e.g., *bird-robin*);
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *position-based associations* whose relation to the cue word is based in their frequency of co-
4 occurrence in everyday language (e.g., *blue-moon*); and *form-based associations* are those
5 that have an orthographic and/or phonological similarity (e.g., *plug-plum*; *chair-choir*; *air-*
6 *heir*). Evidence shows that when individuals provide associative responses in their first
7 language the majority of links between the cue word and a response are meaning based, while
8 only very few associations responses tend to be based on the orthographic or phonological
9 form (Fitzpatrick, 2006; Meara 2009). Importantly, when bilingual speakers are asked to
10 provide associations in their second language (L2) the percentage of associative responses
11 related in form to the cue word is higher than that produced in their first language, suggesting
12 either weaker semantic connections for their L2 words or stronger form based relationships
13 among their L2 words (Fitzpatrick & Izura, 2011).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The present study collected word association responses for the 146 acronyms described by
25 Izura and Playfoot (in press) and examined the influence of associative strength, meaning set
26 size, response category, word frequency, age of acquisition and imageability on the speed
27 with which an associative response was generated. According to Steyvers and Tenenbaum's
28 (2005) model, acronyms with high associative strength values will elicit faster responses
29 because the connection between cue and response is strong in a large proportion of
30 participants. It can also be predicted that responses will be quick for acronyms which elicit a
31 large proportion of semantically related words. Finally, it is expected that the age of
32 acquisition, imageability and frequency of an acronym cue will influence response latencies
33 such that response times will be shorter for early acquired, high imageability and high
34 frequency acronyms acting as cues.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Method**

47 *Participants*

48 Fifty participants, 18 male and 32 female, were recruited for this study. The participants
49 were students at Swansea University with a mean age of 22 years (range 19 - 29), and all
50 were native speakers of English without reading deficits and normal or corrected to normal
51 vision.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Materials

The 146 acronyms described in Izura and Playfoot (in press) were presented as cues in a discrete word association task. Values for imageability, age of acquisition, printed and rated frequency were selected from that database. There, imageability estimates were collected using the procedure outlined by Paivio, Yuille and Madigan (1969) by which participants were asked to indicate how easily each acronym evoked a mental image on a 7 point scale. Age of acquisition ratings were gathered following Izura, Hernandez-Muñoz and Ellis' (2005) procedure where participants wrote the age they were when they first learned the acronym presented. Rated frequency was assessed using a 7 point scale ranging from "rarely or never encountered" (1) to "encountered more than twice a day" (7). Printed frequencies were estimated on the basis of the number of hits returned by advanced internet search queries using the AltaVista search engine. This procedure has been shown to provide reliable estimates of frequency (Blair, Urland & Ma, 2002). The printed frequency values were transformed into their logarithm, base 10, plus one value.

Procedure

Stimulus presentation and randomization was achieved using E Prime software (Schneider, Eschman, & Zuccolotto, 2002). Acronyms were presented centrally in black ink on a white background and with Times New Roman font, size 12 points. Participants were informed that they would be seeing a list of acronyms, individually, and that they should say the first thing that came to their mind in response to each acronym. The instructions indicated that there were no right or wrong answers, and that it was important that responses reflected the first word they associated with the stimulus. Each acronym was presented individually in the middle of the computer screen and remained there until the participant responded. The verbal response from the participant was detected by a microphone placed approximately 10 centimetres in front of the mouth. This triggered the program to show a blank screen for 500ms and to record the time that had elapsed between the onset of the presentation of the stimulus and the detection of the response. Then a screen with a horizontal line in the middle appeared to signal participants to type in the response that they had just given. Participants could type their response in their own time and they were allowed to correct spelling

1
2
3 mistakes if the wished to do so. Participants signalled that they had completed typing the
4 word by pressing the return key. Then an asterisk appeared for 500 ms to indicate that the
5 next trial was about to commence. All 146 acronyms were presented to every participant in a
6 random order. The task took between 20 and 25 minutes to complete.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Results**

14
15 Omissions were removed from the assessments of word association responses. Spelling
16 mistakes and typographical errors were corrected only if the participant's intended response
17 was clear (e.g. TNT – '*dinamite*'). If the response recorded was potentially a spelling
18 mistake but made another word, this was not altered (MRI – scam) because of the difficulty
19 of being certain of the participant's intention. Although it could be argued that the intended
20 response is clear in this example, other instances were not so obvious. Therefore a consistent
21 procedure was employed for all responses to all cues. The complete set of word association
22 responses is included in the appendix.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Six participants offered association responses for fewer than half of the items presented, and
33 were, therefore deleted from further analyses. Thus the analyses reported here are based on
34 the responses from 44 participants. A multilevel or hierarchical regression analysis (Miles &
35 Shevlin, 2001) was used here with RT as the outcome variable. The multilevel model is an
36 extension of linear regression to allow variation between groups to be accounted for at
37 different levels (Gelman & Hill, 2007). This offers an important advantage over classical
38 regression in that systematic variation among the participants can be accounted for before
39 assessing the variables under study. Essentially, each step of the hierarchy assesses whether
40 newly entered variables are able to add to the variance in the outcome variable that can be
41 explained by the model over and above that which was accounted for in the previous step. In
42 this case, the participants were entered in the first level of the hierarchy. Important individual
43 differences have been shown to occur in word association responses (Fitzpatrick 2007; 2009),
44 so entering participants in the first step of the analysis partialled out the potential influence of
45 individual differences on reaction times. In the second level of the analysis the proportion of
46 responses that could be classified as semantic, position-based or form-based were included.
47 The third level assessed the predictive power of associative strength and number of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responses. The methods for determining these values are detailed below. The fourth and
4 final step of the regression analyses included the following acronym characteristics,
5 frequency, age of acquisition, imageability and letter length.
6
7
8
9

10 11 *Categorisation of word association responses*

12
13 Word association responses were classified into three categories according to the type of
14 relationship that was found between the cue and the response produced. These categories
15 were: form based, meaning based, and position based associates (Fitzpatrick, 2006). The
16 meaning based category included responses that had a meaning relation with the cue word.
17 Thus, synonyms (e.g. ASAP – quickly), acronym’s complete or partial forms (e.g., ASAP –
18 as soon as possible; KFC - chicken), hyponym s and co-hyponyms (e.g., RPG standing for
19 rocket propelled grenade - rifle) and others (e.g., ECG – hospital or heart) were included in
20 the meaning based category. Position based responses were those that frequently co-occur
21 with the acronym in the natural language (e.g., SCUBA – diving). Associative responses
22 were classed as form based when the response shared orthography or phonology with the cue,
23 but not meaning. These were commonly instances where letters had been transposed (FBI –
24 FIB), substituted (TFT – TNT), added (BST – best) or omitted (RNIB – nib).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Examination of the responses indicated that in some instances associations may have been
38 made in two steps. For example, when presented with CCCP, eight participants responded
39 with “camera.” The participants could potentially have arrived at this response by a two
40 stage process, first transforming CCCP to the orthographically and phonologically similar
41 CCTV and then providing the constituent word “camera.” Responses of this type were
42 counted as a separate category and not included in the analyses presented here. Associations
43 for which no clear discernible link between cue and response could be found were classed as
44 erratic responses and removed from analyses. Circumstances where the participant had
45 invented a new full form for the acronym were classified as erratic responses and also
46 removed from further analyses. The total percentage of responses classified as members of
47 each category are presented in Table 1.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Table 1 about here)

As shown the majority of responses were meaning based, with only very few associations based on position or form alone. These response category measures were converted to proportions for inclusion in the multilevel regression. Thus, the number of semantic responses (33 for MMR) was divided by the total number of responses elicited by the acronym (37), making the proportion of semantic responses to MMR 0.89.

Associative strength and meaning set size

Associative strength refers to the proportion of participants who gave the most common response to each acronym. Singular (e.g. cat) and regular plural (created by adding an “s” as in cats) forms of a word were considered to be the same response. Irregular plurals were counted as a separate response. The frequency with which the dominant response was recorded by the participants was divided by the total number of responses to that cue to determine associative strength. For example, the most frequently given associate for BBC was “television” which was offered by 24 participants. All 44 of the participants recorded a valid associative response for BBC. Therefore the associative strength for “television” is 24 out of 44, or 0.55. The meaning set size was the total number of different responses given by two or more participants for each cue. This measure was also entered into the regression analysis.

Reaction time analyses

Response latencies for omissions (14%) were removed prior to reaction time analysis. Trials in which the voice key had malfunctioned (3%) were also deleted from these analyses. Correlations between the lexical variables (i.e., imageability, rated and printed frequency, age of acquisition and letter length), the measures indicating the type of link between cue and response (i.e., meaning, position and form based), the measures of response distribution (i.e., associative strength and meaning set size) and RTs are presented in Table 2.

1
2
3 (Table 2 about here)
4
5

6 Significant correlations were found between all of the predictor variables and RT, with the
7 exception of printed frequency and number of position responses. Acronyms which were
8 high in rated frequency, high imageability, early acquired or lengthy generated association
9 responses more quickly than their short, low frequency, low imageability or late acquired
10 counterparts. This supports the findings of de Groot's (1989) and Brysbaert et al.'s (2000)
11 association studies using mainstream word cues. In relation to the proportion of responses
12 which could be classified in each category, significant correlations were observed with all
13 other variables. The only exceptions to this were the non-significant correlations between
14 position and length, position and age of acquisition and form and printed frequency.
15 Associative strength was significantly correlated with all other variables, and meaning set
16 size correlated with all but printed frequency. Finally, the correlations between pairs of
17 predictor variables were all significant, and mirror the general relationships between these
18 variables in mainstream word studies (e.g. Balota et al., 2004).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 For the purpose of all analyses reported here, acronym naming times were log transformed to
31 reduce skew. Multicollinearity of the predictor variables was assessed in relation to the
32 variance inflation factor (VIF). VIF values were within the acceptable range (1.04 to 3.30).
33 Beta coefficients for each of the predictor variables are presented in Table 3.
34
35
36
37
38

39 (Table 3 about here)
40
41
42
43

44 In step 2, the proportion of responses that were linked to the cue acronym semantically or in
45 terms of their form significantly predicted reaction times. Responses were likely to be fast
46 for cues which elicit a high proportion of semantic responses and slow in cues with high
47 proportions of form links. In step 3, both associative strength and meaning set size were
48 predictive of reaction times. Particularly strong and commonly generated links between cue
49 and response were given quickly. Responses were generally slow when a large number of
50 different associations were recorded for the same cue. Imageability, age of acquisition and
51 length emerged as significant predictors of word association response latency in step 4. As a
52 whole, the regression model was able to account for 24% of the variance in RT.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Word association has traditionally been considered a semantic task (Brysbaert et al., 2000).
6
7 This is clearly the case in this study given that the majority of the responses are semantically
8 related to the cue word (94%), and suggests a good level of acronym knowledge among the
9 participants in this study. However, as mentioned in the introduction, not all responses in
10 word association tasks are semantic, since some of them appear to be the result of co-
11 occurrence of cue and response, and others share only their orthographic form. In order to
12 give a purer assessment of the lexical factors affecting semantic access for acronyms, the
13 influence of the lexical variables on reaction times was reassessed, this time taking into
14 account only those responses that were semantically linked to the cue. The results of the
15 multiple regression analysis carried out are presented in Table 4. When considering only
16 semantic responses, age of acquisition and imageability were the only significant predictors
17 of reaction times. The proportion of the variance accounted for by the model increased to
18 42%.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 (Table 4 about here)
31
32
33
34

35 Discussion

36
37 The present study investigated the influence of a number of lexico-semantic factors on
38 acronym association response times. Two analyses were carried out. The first analysis used a
39 multilevel regression technique to take into consideration the variance associated with
40 individual differences and to observe the influence of the selected predictors at three different
41 levels of analysis. Individual differences were entered in the first step of the analysis. In the
42 second step the influence of the type of link between cue and response was examined while
43 the predictive power of two response distribution measures (i.e., associative strength and
44 meaning set size) and acronym characteristics were entered into the third and fourth steps of
45 the analysis respectively. Responses were made quicker to cues that: 1) elicited a large
46 proportion of semantic responses, 2) a low proportion of form responses, 3) were high in
47 associative strength, 4) were low in meaning set size, 5) were long, early acquired and
48 imageable. The second analysis used multiple regression analysis to consider the influence of
49 lexical variables on RTs for only those responses that were semantically linked to the cue. As
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in previous reports, participants were shown to be faster to respond to cues which were
4 imageable and early acquired (Altarriba et al., 1999; Brysbaert et al., 2000; de Groot, 1989).
5 A higher proportion of the variance in RT was accounted for when only lexical factors and
6 semantic responses were considered, implying that the factors considered were better at
7 explaining the variance associated to semantic than to any other response. It is important to
8 note that among the factors considered, imageability and age of acquisition were the only
9 significant predictors for associative responses linked to the cue by meaning.
10

11
12
13
14
15 It is worth noting that as in studies with mainstream words the majority of responses elicited
16 in a discrete association task using acronyms were related to the meaning of the cue
17 (Fitzpatrick, 2006). In contrast only a small proportion of word association responses were
18 form based and an even smaller proportion of responses were position based (i.e., responses
19 that often co-occur with the target). Interestingly, this is closer to the pattern of associative
20 responses produced to mainstream words by second language speakers of English than those
21 produced by first language speakers (Fitzpatrick & Izura, 2011). Thus, in the first language
22 there are more position than form based responses while the reverse is the case in the second
23 language. This might suggest that the semantic connections of some acronyms are weak or
24 not very stable as it also happens for some second language words. On those occasions
25 individuals used the potentially stronger lexical connections providing associative responses
26 that shared the form rather than meaning. The scarcity of position based responses might
27 reflect the fact that the use of acronyms is not as profuse as that of mainstream words.
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 In relation to the response distribution measures, meaning set size and associative strength,
39 the present study replicate and extend on previous findings reporting semantic effects on
40 word recognition times. Associative strength and meaning set size affected response
41 association times as it has also been reported to affect word recognition times (Balota et al.,
42 2004; Buchanan, Westbury & Burgess, 2001). The fact that words with large meaning set
43 sizes generated slower responses might be related to a similar result found by Mirman and
44 Magnuson (2008) where individuals were slower at discriminating words with many near
45 neighbours (i.e., words that had a closer semantic distance with the cue word) and is
46 congruent with the finding of faster response times for words with high associative strength
47 and therefore low in meaning set size.
48

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
One finding of particular interest is that word association responses did not correlate with or
show a significant effect of printed frequency. The nature of acronym creation and use may

1
2
3 be responsible for the lack of correlations with printed frequency. The correlation between
4 rated and printed frequency in the acronyms was significant, but relatively low at .34.
5 Acronyms are created to abbreviate cumbersome or technical phrases, and often come from
6 highly specialised fields. As a result acronyms with high printed frequencies may not
7 necessarily be high frequency to all the participants. It is suggested, therefore, that the non-
8 significant correlations with printed frequency indicate that printed frequency measures for
9 acronyms may not equate to individual experience. Considering the word association task is
10 mainly a semantic task, knowledge of the meaning of an acronym is integral to the successful
11 completion of the task. The fact that rated frequency correlated significantly with several
12 aspects of word association behaviour is interpreted as evidence that subjective or rated
13 frequency estimates are, for acronyms at least, a better representation of lexical knowledge
14 than the printed frequency measures. Rated frequency is more likely to reflect the level of
15 familiarity that undergraduate students have with the items. However, once entered into the
16 regression analyses neither rated nor printed frequency was a significant predictor of word
17 association RT. This finding supports the interpretation of de Groot (1989) that frequent
18 encounters with words and their assumed automatic distributed activation to related
19 representations might not be sufficient to strength those connections. It suggests, in addition,
20 that the frequency of a word is not as relevant when providing associative responses as age of
21 acquisition, letter length and imageability are.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Interestingly an effect of word length was observed when all the responses were considered
36 but not when only the responses related in meaning to the cue word were analysed. This
37 seems to be the result of an interaction between word length and the type of link between the
38 cue acronym and the response, with length effects having a significant influence over form
39 based responses but not so much over semantically related responses. This might be because
40 longer acronyms are more likely to look like words and therefore generate rapid responses
41 orthographically similar.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Regression analyses showed that imageability was a significant predictor in the two
49 regression models. De Groot (1989) found that imageability was an important factor in RT
50 and associative strength in a mainstream word association task. De Groot (1989) argued that
51 highly imageable words have relatively strong connections with at least one associated node
52 and that these strong links are shared by a large number of individuals. Thus, the associated
53 concept is retrieved quickly and the same associate is offered by a larger number of
54 participants. The same interpretation would appear to apply in the present study. That said
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the potential semantic complexity of acronyms may benefit from considering other measures
4 of semantic richness such as those discussed by Pexman, Hargreaves, Siakaluk, Bodner and
5 Pope (2008) in future studies. Pexman et al. (2008) studied three measures of semantic
6 richness; 1) number of features in a concept, 2) semantic neighbourhood or the number of
7 words that co-occur in similar contexts and, 3) contextual diversity referring to the extent to
8 which a word is distributed into nine different content areas. They highlighted that each of
9 these measures had previously been demonstrated to affect latencies in word recognition
10 tasks. Pexman et al. (2008) showed that while the three measures had an effect in lexical
11 decision times only number of features and context distribution had an effect in a semantic
12 categorization task. Unlike the present study, however, Pexman et al. (2008) did not control
13 for age of acquisition or imageability. It would therefore be worthwhile investigating the
14 predictive power of semantic neighbourhood, number of features and contextual diversity
15 would be predictive of the speed with which associative responses are generated for
16 acronyms once age of acquisition and imageability are controlled for.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Another important finding is the age of acquisition effect observed when all responses were
31 taken into account (analysis 1) and when only the semantic responses were considered
32 (analysis 2). This finding echoes the age of acquisition influence previously shown in word
33 association tasks. Both van Loon-Vervoorn (1989) and Brysbaert et al. (2000) reported that
34 early acquired words were quicker to produce an association response than words acquired
35 later in life. In addition, Brysbaert et al. (2000) also found a significant effect of age of
36 acquisition on their measure of associative strength. The authors suggested that influence of
37 age of acquisition and imageability on word association had a similar source. Brysbaert et al.
38 (2000) proposed that late acquired words are learned by relating the new 'late' concept to a
39 previously existing word representation. As a result of this learning process the
40 representations for early acquired words are accessed more often, and therefore the links to
41 and from an early acquired node are stronger than for late acquired words. The age of
42 acquisition effects shown in the present study could be the result of a difference in the speed
43 with which early and late acquired acronyms are recognised and the relative strength build in
44 the intra-lexical links. However, the fact that the predictive power of age of acquisition
45 increased when only semantically linked responses were considered suggests that age of
46 acquisition may be a semantic property as suggested by van Loon-Vervoorn (1989) and
47 Brysbaert et al. (2000). Nevertheless, Izura and Ellis (2002; 2004) showed that second
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 language speakers of English were faster at processing words that had been learned early in
4 the second language than words learnt some time later. This occurred even when the early
5 acquired word in English as L2 was a late acquired word in Spanish as L1 and vice versa
6 (e.g., *money* and *travel*, are late learned words in L1 but useful and early acquired in L2 while
7 *witch*, *fairy* are words incorporated early in the L1 vocabulary but late in L2). Considering
8 these reports we are inclined to think that the age of acquisition effect found in the word
9 association task emerges from the lexico-semantic connections that might exist between
10 representations (Ellis & Lambon-Ralph, 2000; Steyvers & Tenenbaum, 2005).
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 This study has provided useful information concerning the concepts commonly associated
18 with acronyms. Further research using acronyms and mainstream words in a word
19 association paradigm could directly compare the similarities and differences between the two
20 types of lexical items. Here it has been shown that associative responses to acronyms in
21 English as a first language have patterns similar to those produce by English second language
22 speakers and are in addition influenced by age of acquisition and imageability.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Altarriba, J., Bauer, L., & Benvenuto, C. (1999). Concreteness, context availability, and
9 imageability ratings and word associations for abstract, concrete, and emotion words.
10
11
12 *Behaviour Research Methods, Instruments and Computers*, 31, 578-602.

13
14
15
16
17 Balota, D. A., Cortese, M. J., Sergent-Marshall, S. D., Spieler, D. H., & Yap, M. J. (2004).
18
19 Visual word recognition of single-syllable words. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
20
21
22 *General*, 133, 283-316.

23
24
25
26
27 Besner, D., Davelaar, E., Alcott, D., & Parry, P. (1984). Wholistic reading of alphabetic print:
28
29 Evidence from the FDM and the FBI. In L. Henderson (Ed.), *Orthographies and reading:*
30
31
32 *Perspectives from cognitive psychology, neuropsychology and linguistics* (pp. 121–135)
33
34 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

35
36
37
38
39 Blair, I. V., Urland, G. R., & Ma, J. E. (2002). Using Internet search engines to estimate word
40
41
42 frequency. *Behavior Research Methods*, 34, 286-290.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Brybaert, M., Speybroeck, S., & Vanderelst, D. (2009). Is there room for the BBC in the
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4
5 Buchanan, L., Westbury, C., & Burgess, C. (2001). Characterizing semantic space:
6
7 Neighbourhood effects in word recognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 8, 531 – 544.
8
9

10
11 Canas, J. J. (1990). Associative strength effects in the lexical decision task. *Quarterly Journal*
12
13 *of Experimental Psychology*, 42A, 121-145.
14
15

16
17
18 Carr, T. H., Posner, M. I., Pollatsek, A., & Snyder, C. R. R. (1979) Orthography and
19
20 familiarity effects in word processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 108,
21
22 389-414.
23
24
25

26
27
28
29 Catling, J.C., & Johnston, R.A. (2005). Age of Acquisition effects on word generation.
30
31 *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 17, 161-177.
32
33

34
35
36
37 Coltheart, M. (1978). Lexical access in simple reading tasks. In G. Underwood (Ed.)
38
39 *Strategies of information processing*. New York: Academic Press.
40
41
42

43
44
45 Connine, C. M., Mullenix, J., Shernoff, E. & Yelen, J. (1990). Word familiarity and
46
47 frequency in visual and auditory word recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
48
49 *Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 16, 1084-1096.
50
51
52

1
2
3 De Groot, A. M. B. (1989). Representational aspects of word imageability and word
4
5 frequency as assessed through word association. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
6
7 *Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, 15, 824-845.
8
9

10
11
12 Ellis, A. W., & Lambon-Ralph, M.A. (2000). Age of acquisition effects in adult lexical
13
14 processing reflect loss of plasticity in maturing systems: Insights from connectionist
15
16 networks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 26, 1103-
17
18 1123.
19
20

21
22
23 Ellis, A. W., Burani, C., Izura, C., Bromiley, A., & Venneri, A. (2006). Traces of vocabulary
24
25 acquisition in the brain: evidence from covert object naming. *NeuroImage*, 33, 958-968.
26
27
28

29
30
31 Fitzpatrick, T. (2006). Habits and rabbits: word associations and the L2 lexicon. *EUROSLA*
32
33 *Yearbook* 6, 121-145.
34
35

36
37
38
39 Fitzpatrick, T. (2007). Word association patterns: unpacking the assumptions. *International*
40
41 *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 319-331.
42
43
44

45
46
47 Fitzpatrick, T. (2009). Word association profiles in a first and second language: Puzzles and
48
49 problems. In Fitzpatrick, T. and Barfield, A. (Eds.), *Lexical Processing in Second Language*
50
51 *Learners*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Fitzpatrick, T. & Izura, C. (2011). Word association in L1 and L2: An exploratory study of
4 response types, response times and inter-language mediation. *Studies in Second Language*
5 *Acquisition*, 33, 3.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2007). *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical*
15 *models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16
17
18
19

20
21 Izura, C., & Ellis, A. W. (2002). Age of acquisition effects in word recognition and
22 production in first and second languages. *Psicologica*, 23, 245-281.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Izura, C., & Ellis, A.W. (2004). Age of acquisition effects in translation judgement tasks.
30
31 *Journal of Memory and Language*, 50, 165-181.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Izura, C., & Playfoot, D. (in press). A normative study of acronyms and acronym naming.
39
40 *Behavior Research Methods*.
41
42
43
44

45
46 Izura, C., Hernandez-Muñoz, N., & Ellis, A. W. (2005). Category norms for 500 Spanish
47 words in five semantic categories. *Behavior Research Methods*, 37, 385-397
48
49
50

51
52 Izura, C., Pérez, M. A. Agallou, E., Wright, V. C., Marín, J., Stadthagen-González, & Ellis,
53 A. W. (2011). Age/order of acquisition effects and the cumulative learning of foreign words:
54 A word training study. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 64, 32-58.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lambon Ralph, M. A., & Ehsan, S. (2006). Age of acquisition effects depend on the mapping
4 between representations and the frequency of occurrence: Empirical and computational
5 evidence. *Visual Cognition*, *13*, 292-248
6
7

8
9
10
11 Laszlo, S. & Federmeier, K. D. (2007a). The acronym superiority effect. *Psychonomic*
12 *Bulletin and Review*, *14*, 1158-1163.
13

14
15
16
17 Laszlo, S. & Federmeier, K. D. (2007b). Better the DVL you know: acronyms reveal the
18 contribution of familiarity to single-word reading. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 122-126.
19
20

21
22
23
24 Laszlo, S. & Federmeier, K. D. (2008). Minding the PS, queues and PXQs: Uniformity of
25 semantic processing across multiple stimulus types. *Psychophysiology*, *45*, 458-466.
26
27

28
29
30
31 Meara, P. (2009). *Connected Words: word associations and second language lexical*
32 *acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
33

34
35
36
37 Miles, J., & Shevlin, M. (2001). *Applying regression & correlation: A guide for students and*
38 *researchers*. London: Sage.
39

40
41
42
43 Mirman, D. and Magnuson, J.S. (2008). Attractor dynamics and semantic neighborhood
44 density: Processing is slowed by near neighbors and speeded by distant neighbors. *Journal of*
45 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, *34*, 65-79.
46
47

48
49
50
51
52 Morrison, C. M., & Ellis, A. W. (2000). Real age of acquisition effects in word naming and
53 lexical decision. *British Journal of Psychology*, *91*, 167-180.
54
55

1
2
3 Nelson, D. L., & Schreiber, T. A. (1992). Word concreteness and word structure as
4 independent determinants of recall. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 31, 237-260.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Noice, H., & Hock, H. S. (1987). A word superiority effect with nonorthographic acronyms:
11 Testing for unitized visual codes. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 42, 485-490.
12
13

14
15
16 Paivio, A., Yuille, J. C., & Madigan, S. A. (1968). Concreteness, imagery, and
17 meaningfulness values for 925 nouns. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 76, 1-25.
18
19
20

21
22
23 Pérez, M. A. (2007). Age of acquisition persists as the main factor in picture naming when
24 cumulative word frequency and frequency trajectory are controlled. *Quarterly Journal of*
25 *Experimental Psychology*, 60, 32-42.
26
27
28

29
30
31 Pexman, P. M., Hargreaves, I. S., Siakaluk, P. D., Bodner, G. E., & Pope, J. (2008). There are
32 many ways to be rich: Effects of three measures of semantic richness on lexical and semantic
33 processing. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 15, 161-167
34
35
36
37

38
39
40 Postman, L. (1964). Short term memory and incidental learning. In W.A. Melton (Ed.)
41 *Categories of Human Learning*, New York: Academic Press (pp. 145-201).
42
43
44

45
46
47 Postman, L. (1970). The California norms: Association as a function of word frequency. In L.
48 Postman & G. Keppel (Eds.). *Norms of word association* (pp. 241-320). New York:
49 Academic Press.
50
51
52

53
54
55
56 Prinzmetal, W., & Millis-Wright, M. (1984). Cognitive and linguistic factors affect visual
57 feature integration. *Cognitive Psychology*, 16, 305-340.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Reicher, G. (1969). Perceptual recognition as a function of meaningfulness of stimulus
6 material. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 81, 275–280.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Richards, R. M., & Ellis, A. W. (2009). Identity, gender, and the role of age of acquisition in
13 face processing. *Psicológica*, 30, 155-178.
14
15
16
17

18
19
20 Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2002). *E-Prime 1.0*. Pittsburgh, PA:
21 Psychological Software Tools.
22
23
24
25

26
27
28 Steyvers, M., & Tenenbaum, J., (2005). The large-scale structure of semantic networks:
29 statistical analyses and a model of semantic growth. *Cognitive Science*, 29, 41-78.
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Van Loon-Vervoorn, W. A. (1989). *Eigenschappen van basiswoorden*. Lisse: Swets and
37 Zeitlinger.
38
39
40
41

42
43
44 Yonelinas, A. P. (2002). The nature of recollection and familiarity: a review of 30 years of
45 research. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 46, 441-517
46
47
48
49

50 51 52 53 54 **Appendix**

55 **Acronym cues used in the word association task.**

56

57 ABBA CBT FBI KFC OHP SPSS
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ACDC	CCCP	FIFA	LBW	PAYE	STD
ADHD	CEO	FYI	LCD	PDA	TBA
AGM	CIA	GBH	LMAO	PDF	TCP
AOL	CJD	GCSE	LSD	PGCE	TFT
APR	CNN	GMT	MBA	PSP	TLC
ASAP	CPU	GPA	MDMA	PTA	TNT
ASBO	CSI	GPS	MGM	PTO	UCAS
ATM	DHL	HDTV	MMR	PTSD	UEFA
AWOL	DIY	HGV	MRI	PVC	UFC
BAFTA	DNA	HIV	MRSA	QVC	UFO
BBC	DOA	HMO	MSN	RAF	UHF
BHS	DOB	HMS	MTV	RBS	USA
BLT	DUI	HMV	NASA	REM	USB
BMI	DVD	HRT	NASCAR	RNIB	USSR
BMW	DVLA	HSBC	NATO	RNLI	VCR
BNP	DVT	IBM	NBA	RPG	VHS
BOGOF	ECG	IBS	NCIS	RRP	VIP
BPM	EEG	ICT	NHS	RSPB	WWF
BPS	ENT	IMDB	NSPCC	RSPCA	YMCA
BRB	ESP	IRA	NYPD	RSVP	
BSE	ESRC	ISP	OAP	SAE	
BST	ETA	ITN	OBE	SAS	
BTW	FAO	ITV	OCD	SCUBA	
BYOB	FAQ	IVF	OCR	SMS	

Table 1 – Percentage of word association responses in each cue-response category, along with mean and standard deviation of response types per cue.

	Total percentage	Mean number per cue	Standard deviation
Semantic	94	30.96	8.83
Position	< 1	.30	.89
Form	6	1.73	2.83

Table 2 – Correlations between predictor variables and reaction times

	Rated Frequency	Printed Frequency	Age of Acquisition	Imageability	Letter Length	Semantic Relation	Position Relation	Form Relation	No of ass. Responses	RTs
Ass. Strength	0.17**	0.07**	-0.25**	0.34**	0.22**	0.14**	-0.15**	-0.27**	-0.64**	-0.14**
Rated Frequency		0.34**	-0.17**	0.57**	-0.11**	0.30**	0.19**	-0.28**	-0.24**	-0.09**
Printed Frequency			-0.03*	0.11**	-0.36**	0.06**	0.06**	n.s	n.s	n.s
Age of Acquisition				-0.55**	0.03*	-0.18**	n.s.	0.18**	0.39**	0.15**
Imageability					0.10**	0.55**	0.06**	-0.44**	-0.44**	-0.18**
Letter Length						0.05**	n.s.	-0.14**	-0.07**	-0.05**
Semantic Relation							-0.14**	-0.40**	-0.24**	-0.08**
Position Relation								-0.06**	0.17**	n.s
Form Relation									0.32**	0.09**
No of ass. responses										0.20**

Note: * p < .05 ** p < .001 n.s. non-significant. RT = reaction times. Freq = frequency. Ass = Associative. No = Number

Table 3 – Beta coefficients for each predictor in the multilevel regression analysis

		β
Step 2	Semantic links	-.077**
	Position links	.019
	Form links	.056**
Adjusted R^2		.184**
Step 3	Associative Strength	-.037*
	Number of responses	.191**
Adjusted R^2		.224**
Step 4	Rated Frequency	-.024
	Printed Frequency	.000
	Age of Acquisition	.053*
	Imageability	-.091**
	Letter Length	-.036*
Adjusted R^2		.236**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4 – Beta coefficients for predictor variables when only RTs to semantically related responses were considered

	β
Rated Frequency	.004
Printed Frequency	.132
AoA	.256*
Imageability	-.462**
Letter Length	-.100
Adjusted R^2	.416**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$